

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Remarks Regarding Amendments

The Amendments to claims 1, 9 and 15 are supported throughout the specification including the original claims. No new matter is introduced by these amendments and their entry is requested.

Withdrawal of Terminal Disclaimer

In the current Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that due to an error in the Final Office Action of January 5, 2009, the terminal disclaimer filed on April 2, 2009 contains an incorrect application number. Furthermore, the Final Office Action of January 5, 2009 has been withdrawn.

The April 2, 2009 terminal disclaimer was filed for the purpose of expediting prosecution in response to the Final Office of January 5, 2009. Since the Examiner has withdrawn the January 5, 2009 Office Action, Applicants also wish to withdraw the April 2, 2009 terminal disclaimer.

A petition for the withdrawal of the April 2, 2009 terminal disclaimer is submitted with this Response and Amendment.

Remarks Regarding 112 First Paragraph

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse.

Specifically, the Examiner objected to the amending of claim 1 to remove the term “respectively” stating that amended claim 1 does not comply with the written description requirement. Solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to reintroduce this term. Thus, this rejection is moot and its withdrawal is requested.

Remarks Regarding 112 Second Paragraph

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Specifically, claims 1, 9 and 15 are allegedly indefinite and claims 2-8, 10-14 and 16-17 are allegedly indefinite for depending on an indefinite claim. Applicants traverse.

Solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1, 9 and 15 according to the examiner's suggestions. Thus, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

Remarks Regarding Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-17 stand rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. patent 7,524,906. Applicants traverse.

Solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have submitted a terminal disclaimer with this Amendment and Response. Thus, this rejection is moot and its withdrawal is requested.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to the pending Office Action, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit an early Notice to that effect. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if additional information is required.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____/Eric Sinn/

Eric Sinn
Reg. No. 40,177

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100